

Robert B. Pringle (CA Bar No. 051365)
 Paul R. Griffin (CA Bar No. 083541)
 Patrick M. Ryan (CA Bar No. 203215)
 Jonathan E. Swartz (CA Bar No. 203624)
 Sean D. Meenan (CA Bar No. 260466)

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

101 California Street
 San Francisco, CA 94111-5894

Telephone: 415-591-1000

Facsimile: 415-591-1400

rpringle@winston.com

pgriffin@winston.com

pryan@winston.com

jswartz@winston.com

smeen@winston.com

Attorneys for Defendants
 NEC ELECTRONICS CORPORATION and
 NEC ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.

[Other Counsel and Defendants Appear on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

IN RE STATIC RANDOM ACCESS
 MEMORY (SRAM) ANTITRUST
 LITIGATION

Case No.: M:07-cv-1819 CW

MDL No. 1819

This Document Relates To:

All Indirect Purchaser Actions

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
 ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF FOR LEAVE
 TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
 REGARDING INACCURATE
 STATEMENTS AND NEW ISSUES
 RAISED AT THE HEARING ON CLASS
 CERTIFICATION**

Judge: Hon. Claudia Wilken

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, Defendants hereby move for administrative relief for leave to file a supplemental brief to correct certain misstatements by Plaintiffs at the September 3, 2009 hearing on class certification and to address new issues raised by the Court at the hearing that

were not briefed by the parties. The supplemental brief Defendants seek to file is attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of Patrick M. Ryan in support of this Motion.

Defendants' counsel met and conferred with Plaintiffs' counsel regarding the filing of this brief. Initially, Plaintiffs' counsel indicated that they might stipulate to the filing of simultaneous supplemental briefs because a number of issues raised at the hearing had not been briefed, but on the day of the filing of this motion, Plaintiffs decided not to stipulate to the filing of supplemental briefs. (Declaration of Patrick M. Ryan in support of this Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief, ¶ 3–7.)

I. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO ALLOW FOR THE FILING OF A SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

To aid the Court in deciding the issues raised at the hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification, Defendants seek leave to file a supplemental brief to address certain materially inaccurate statements made by Plaintiffs at the hearing with respect to the nature of their claims and the injury requirements Plaintiffs must meet for certification of a nationwide injunctive class under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) as well as a damages and restitutionary class under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3).

For example, at the class certification hearing, Plaintiffs created the impression that they did not plead a legal damages claim under California law and that they are only asking for equitable relief for which a bench trial is sought. This is contrary to Plaintiffs' own pleadings. Plaintiffs brought a claim for relief under the Cartwright Act for damages, which will be tried to a jury if this case is certified. (*See* Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint at ¶ 209.) Plaintiffs also represented at the hearing that an evidentiary showing of injury is not required to assert a claim for injunctive relief under California or federal law. This patently misstates the law in the Ninth Circuit. It is black-letter law that both claims require that each class representative make an evidentiary showing of actual individualized injury to establish standing and to establish that certification may be granted. Plaintiffs also misstated the injury requirement with respect to restitution under many states' unfair competition statutes, including a claim under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

The supplemental brief defendants seek leave to file also addresses new issues raised by the Court at the hearing that were not briefed by the parties, including whether the Court must consider injury to individual proposed class representatives for certification of a injunctive class or a restitutionary class and whether the Court should bifurcate the issue of conspiracy from injury.

Because the Court is entertaining Plaintiffs' arguments, including the inaccuracies stated at the hearing, in its consideration of class certification, good cause exists for Defendants to present the Court with the applicable authority on these pertinent issues. On this basis, Defendants seek permission from the Court to file the supplemental brief attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of Patrick M. Ryan in support of this Motion.

II. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Defendants respectfully request that the Court grant Defendants' Administrative Motion for Leave to File a Supplemental Brief Regarding Inaccurate Statements and New Issues Raised at the Hearing on Class Certification and order the supplemental brief attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of Patrick M. Ryan deemed filed *nunc pro tunc* as of the date of the filing of this Motion.

Dated: September 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

By /s/ Sean D. Meenan
SEAN D. MEENAN
Attorneys for Defendants
NEC ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
and NEC ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.

I, Sean D. Meenan, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. General Order No. 45, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

/s/ Sean D. Meenan
Sean D. Meenan

Winston & Strawn LLP
101 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-5894

Additional Defendants and Counsel:

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

WHITE & CASE LLP

By /s/ Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee
Attorneys for Defendants
Toshiba Corporation and Toshiba
America Electronic Components, Inc.

By /s/ Matthew S. Leddicotte
Matthew S. Leddicotte (*pro hac vice*)
Attorneys for Defendant Etron Technology
America, Inc.

MAYER BROWN LLP

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

By /s/ Robert E. Bloch
Robert E. Bloch (*pro hac vice*)
Attorneys for Defendant
Cypress Semiconductor, Inc.

By /s/ Michael F. Tubach
Michael F. Tubach
Attorneys for Defendants
Hynix Semiconductor Inc., and
Hynix Semiconductor America Inc.

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

**SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER &
HAMPTON LLP**

By /s/ Craig P. Seebald
Craig P. Seebald (*pro hac vice*)
Vincent van Panhuys (*pro hac vice*)
Attorneys for Defendants Renesas
Technology Corp., Renesas Technology
America, Inc., Mitsubishi Electric
Corporation, and Mitsubishi Electric &
Electronics USA, Inc.

By /s/ James L. McGinnis
James L. McGinnis
Attorneys for Defendants
Samsung Electronics America, Inc.,
Samsung Electronics Company, Ltd., and
Samsung Semiconductor, Inc